



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/634,261	08/05/2003	Frank P. Baldiga	RSW920030052US1	7054
70854	7590	04/29/2011	EXAMINER	
WILSON HAM & HOLMAN/RSW 1361 N Hwy 89, Suite 9 Farmington, UT 84025				WHIPPLE, BRIAN P
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2448				
NOTIFICATION DATE			DELIVERY MODE	
04/29/2011			ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JEFF@TECHPATENTS.COM
LAUREN@TECHPATENTS.COM

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/634,261	BALDIGA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Brian P. Whipple	2448	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 August 2003.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-11 and 13-21 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-11 and 13-21 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-11 and 13-21 are pending in this application and presented for examination.
2. In view of the appeal brief filed on 2/4/11, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED.

New grounds of rejection are set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

5. As to claim 18, the claimed program product is not adequately described as to eliminate transitory, non-statutory, embodiments. The applicant is advised that recent Office guidelines suggest adding the term “non-transitory” to overcome such rejections. Alternatives also include amending to indicate the storage medium as a “device” or language indicating the medium is not a signal.

6. As to claims 19-20, the claims are rejected due to their dependency on, and inclusion of, the rejected subject matter of claim 18 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a

person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 9-11, and 14-21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nazari, U.S. Patent No. 6,842,789 B1, in view of Okano et al. (Okano), U.S. Publication No. 2002/0062485 A1, and further in view of Kuehl et al. (Kuehl), U.S. Patent No. 7,398,310 B1.

9. As to claim 1, Nazari discloses a method for assigning a device identifier to a device (Abstract, ln. 1-4), the method comprising:

receiving a request at a server from the device for the device identifier (Col. 3, ln. 32-38; Col. 5, ln. 48-53);

obtaining the device identifier (Col. 5, ln. 54-60), the device identifier being unique from device identifiers of other devices identified by the server (Abstract, ln. 1-4, “wherein the identifier is unique across the distributed computing system”) and distinct from a network address of the device (Fig. 2; Col. 4, ln. 18-37);

sending the device identifier to the device (Col. 5, ln. 63 – Col. 6, ln. 4); and

marking the status of the device identifier as in use after receiving an acknowledgment from the device (Col. 5, ln. 63 – Col. 6, ln. 9).

Nazari is silent on the request is accompanied by correlation data with unique identification information associated with the device;

the device identifier is obtained at the server and associated by the server with correlation data from the device in response to the request from the device;

marking a status of the device identifier as pending;

the device identifier is accompanied by the correlation data associated with the device;

the acknowledgment is accompanied by the correlation data associated with the device; and

sending a confirmation to the device after the acknowledgment is received, wherein the confirmation is accompanied by the correlation data associated with the device.

However, Okano discloses the device identifier is obtained at the server and in response to the request from the device ([0092]; [0195] – [0196]);

marking a status of the device identifier as pending ([0092]; the IP addresses are set as temporarily allocated, which is marking the device identifiers as pending); and

sending a confirmation to the device after the acknowledgment is received ([0102]; [0105]; [0110]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Nazari in the aforementioned manner as taught by

Okano in order to send communications back and forth in response to each step of device identifier assignment so as to ensure each step is approved and the communication partner is informed of the successful approval/completion of each step.

Nazari and Okano are silent on the request is accompanied by correlation data with unique identification information associated with the device; associated by the server with correlation data from the device; the device identifier is accompanied by the correlation data associated with the device;

the acknowledgment is accompanied by the correlation data associated with the device; and

the confirmation is accompanied by the correlation data associated with the device.

However, Kuehl discloses the request is accompanied by correlation data with unique identification information associated with the device (Fig. 2, item 210; Fig. 4, item 410; Fig. 5, item 410; Col. 4, ln. 56-57; Col. 4, ln. 64 - Col. 5, ln. 3; Col. 6, ln. 12-13); associated by the server with correlation data from the device (Fig. 2, items 220, 230, and 240; Col. 5, ln. 5-7 and 14-16);

the device identifier is accompanied by the correlation data associated with the device (Fig. 2, item 210; Fig. 4, item 410; Fig. 5, item 410; Col. 4, ln. 56-57; Col. 4, ln. 64 - Col. 5, ln. 3; Col. 6, ln. 12-13);

the acknowledgment is accompanied by the correlation data associated with the device (Col. 5, ln. 17-21; Col. 7, ln. 9-22); and

the confirmation is accompanied by the correlation data associated with the device (Col. 5, ln. 17-21; Col. 7, ln. 9-22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Nazari and Okano in the aforementioned manner as taught by Kuehl in order to efficiently track entities as they move in a network and correlate valid access to the proper device, whereas correlating invalid access with alarms (Kuehl: Col. 2, ln. 8-17).

10. As to claim 2, Nazari, Okano, and Kuehl disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 1, further comprising:

receiving a second acknowledgment from the device (Okano: [0110]-[0111]; [0149]-[0151]; it is inherent in and a standard feature of DHCP, which is taught by Okano, that a second acknowledgement is sent from a device to renew its lease); and

sending a second confirmation to the device (Okano: [0102]; [0110]-[0111]; [0147]-[0151]; it is inherent in and a standard feature of DHCP, which is taught by Okano, that a server sends a confirmation to renewal requests in the form of a DHCPACK message to extend a device's lease).

11. As to claim 3, Nazari, Okano, and Kuehl disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 1, further comprising managing a set of device entries at the server (Nazari: Col. 3, ln. 32-38; Col. 5, ln. 26-29 and 54-60), wherein each of the device entries comprises a unique device identifier (Nazari: Abstract, ln. 1-4), a status indicator to indicate a status of the corresponding device identifier (Okano: [0092]; [0135]; [0179] – [0180]; [0195] – [0197]), and correlation data associated with the corresponding device identifier (Okano: [0092]; [0195] – [0196]).

12. As to claim 5, Nazari, Okano, and Kuehl disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 3, wherein each of the device entries further includes a timestamp, the method further comprising setting the timestamp when the status is marked as pending (Okano: [0092]; temporarily allocated IP addresses are made and lease times are set, which is setting a timestamp when the status is marked as pending).

13. As to claim 6, Nazari, Okano, and Kuehl disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 1, wherein obtaining the device identifier comprises:

generating the device identifier before the request from the device is received at the server (Nazari: Col. 5, ln. 54-60; the global pool of instance numbers is present before the request is received);

marking the status of the device identifier as unused (Nazari: Col. 5, ln. 54-60; the global pool consists of unused and available instance numbers); and
locating the device identifier having the status marked as unused after the request is received (Nazari: Col. 5, ln. 54-60; the provisional instance number may be identified as available, that is unused, in the global pool of instance numbers).

14. As to claim 9, Nazari, Okano, and Kuehl disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 1, further comprising:

reusing the device identifier for another request received from another device after a time out period has elapsed (Okano: [0200]); and

sending a rejection to the device if the acknowledgment is received after the time out period has elapsed (Okano: [0200]; the timed out subscriber terminal is disabled to use the IP address, which is a rejection).

15. As to claim 21, the claim is rejected for reasons similar to claim 6 above.

16. As to claim 10, the claim is rejected for reasons similar to claim 1 above.
17. As to claim 11, the claim is rejected for reasons similar to claim 5 above.
18. As to claim 14, Nazari, Okano, and Kuehl disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 10, further comprising sending a second acknowledgment to the server if the confirmation has not been received after a time out period (Okano: Abstract; it is inherent in and a standard feature of DHCP, which is taught by Okano, that a second acknowledgement is sent to the server after a time out period).
19. As to claims 15-16, the claims are rejected for reasons similar to claim 1 above.
20. As to claim 17, the claim is rejected for reasons similar to claim 3 above.
21. As to claims 18-19, the claims are rejected for reasons similar to claim 1 above.
22. As to claim 20, the claim is rejected for reasons similar to claim 9 above.

23. Claims 4, 7, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nazari, Okano, and Kuehl as applied to claims 1-3, 5-6, 9-11, and 14-21 above, and further in view of Matsuda et al. (Matsuda), U.S. Publication No. 2002/0133573 A1.

24. As to claim 4, Nazari, Okano, and Kuehl disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 3, wherein the correlation data comprises:

device data to particularly identify the corresponding device (Okano: [0092]; [0195] – [0196]; the MAC address identifies a corresponding device).

Nazari, Okano, and Kuehl are silent on user data to identify a particular user of the corresponding device.

However, Matsuda discloses user data to identify a particular user of the corresponding device ([0065], ln. 5-7; [0066], ln. 1-4; [0115]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Nazari, Okano, and Kuehl in the aforementioned manner as taught by Matsuda in order to identify a user and ensure access is granted before allowing changes to be made to the system (Matsuda: [0115]).

25. As to claim 7, Nazari, Okano, and Kuehl disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 1, but are silent on obtaining the device identifier comprises generating the device identifier after receiving the request.

However, Matsuda discloses obtaining the device identifier comprises generating the device identifier after receiving the request (Fig. 7, items 704, 706, and 708; [0065]; a device identifier is generated using the MAC address, desired IP address, and desired host name in the request, which is correlation data in the request).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Nazari, Okano, and Kuehl in the aforementioned manner as taught by Matsuda in order to allow a client to suggest desired settings in a request (Matsuda: [0065], ln. 5-7).

26. As to claim 13, the claim is rejected for reasons similar to claim 4 above.

27. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nazari, Okano, and Kuehl as applied to claims 1-3, 5-6, 9-11, and 14-21 above, and further in view of Meier, U.S. Patent No. 7,096,273 B1.

28. As to claim 8, Nazari, Okano, and Kuehl disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 1, but are silent on marking the status of the device identifier as unused if the acknowledgment is not received after a time out period.

However, Meier discloses marking the status of the device identifier as unused if the acknowledgment is not received after a time out period (Col. 2, ln. 8-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Nazari, Okano, and Kuehl by marking a device identifier as unused if an acknowledgement is not received after a time out period as taught by Meier in order to put the device identifier back into a pool ready to be re-used (Meier, Col. 2, ln. 13-15).

Conclusion

29. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See the Notice of References Cited (PTO-892).

30. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian P. Whipple whose telephone number is (571)270-1244. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30 AM to 5:00 PM EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Firmin Backer can be reached on 571-272-6703. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Brian P. Whipple
/B. P. W./
Examiner, Art Unit 2448
4/14/11

/ARIO ETIENNE/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2457